

REMARKS

Claim 17 has been amended to more particularly define Applicants' invention. Support for the amendment to Claim 17 is found on page 15, second paragraph.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 17 - 21, 25 - 29, 33, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. 5,520,841 issued to Block et al. for the reasons of record stated on page 2 of the Office Action.

Block et al. purports to relate to a composition and process for producing a storable, pumpable alkaline cleaning concentrate. However, Block et al. does not disclose an ultrasonic cleaning composition which is *inter alia* low foaming, has an inter facial tension of from about 10 mNm⁻¹ to about 0.0001 mNm⁻¹, is substantially free of antifoaming agents, and includes a nonionic surfactant system which includes at least one nonionic surfactant having a cloud point greater than 60°C which has an HLB value from about 9 to about 15 and at least one nonionic surfactant having a cloud point less than 10°C.

Hence, Claims 17 - 21, 25 - 29, and 33 - 34 of the instant invention are not anticipated by Block et al.

Claims 17 - 21, 25 - 29, and 33 - 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. 5,612,305 issued to Lewis for the reasons of record stated on page 3 of the Office Action.

Lewis purports to relate to a dishwashing detergent which is a mixture of a low-foaming nonionic surfactant and a high-foaming nonionic surfactant. However, Lewis does not disclose an ultrasonic cleaning composition which *inter alia* has an inter facial tension of from about 10 mNm⁻¹ to about 0.0001 mNm⁻¹ and includes a nonionic surfactant system which includes at least one nonionic surfactant having a cloud point greater than 60°C which has an HLB value from about 9 to about 15 and at least one nonionic surfactant having a cloud point less than 10°C. Hence, Claims 17 - 21, 25 - 29, and 33 - 34 of the instant invention are not anticipated by Lewis.

As it is believed that the rejections of Claims 17 - 21, 25 - 29, and 33 - 34 under 35 U.S.C. §102 are overcome, Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn and the claims allowed.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 17 - 22 and 25 - 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis in view of U.S. 5,612,305 issued to Evans for the reasons of record stated on pages 3 and 4 of the office Action.

As indicated above, Lewis purports to relate to a dishwashing detergent which is a mixture of a low-foaming nonionic surfactant and a high-foaming nonionic surfactant. Evans purports to relate to a dishwasher apparatus and method for cleaning kitchen and dining ware.


However, Lewis in view of Evans does not disclose an ultrasonic cleaning composition which has *inter alia* an inter facial tension of from about 10 mNm^{-1} to about 0.0001 mNm^{-1} and includes a nonionic surfactant system which includes at least one nonionic surfactant having a cloud point greater than 60°C which has an HLB value from about 9 to about 15 and at least one nonionic surfactant having a cloud point less than 10°C . Hence, Claims 17 - 22 and 25 - 34 are not obvious over Lewis in view of Evans. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 17 - 22 and 25 - 34 over Lewis in view of Evans be reconsidered and withdrawn and the claims allowed.

SUMMARY

This is an RCE responsive to the final Office Action dated September 23, 2005. Authorization is provided to charge any fees associated with this response to Deposit Account No.: 16-2480. As the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 and 35 U.S.C. §103 have been overcome, Applicants respectfully request these rejections be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Respectfully submitted,
FOR: JEAN-FRANCOIS BODET ET AL.;

BY:


Julia A. Glazer
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 41,783
(513) 627-4132

December 23, 2005
Cincinnati, Ohio